

FEAR OF RACISM AND DEATH

FORMAL COMPLAINT, REQUEST FOR URGENT INVESTIGATION, RECTIFICATION OF COURT RECORD, IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONSIBLE PERSONS, PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE AND EXPLANATION OF SAFEGUARDS

TWO SEPARATE FAILURES CONCERNING NOTIFICATION OF MY REQUIRED COURT ATTENDANCE — RISK OF AN ATTENDING DEFENDANT BEING TREATED AS ABSENT — CASE REFERENCE 01GD1160226

Derrick Emmanuel Lynch
also known as John Canoe

23 Jersey House
2 Eastfield Road
Enfield
London
EN3 5UY
United Kingdom

To:

The Court Manager
Wood Green Crown Court
Woodall House
Lordship Lane
Wood Green
London
N22 5LF
United Kingdom

Case Reference: 01GD1160226

Date of incident: 24 September 2026

1. PURPOSE AND SERIOUSNESS OF THIS DOCUMENT

I write to make a formal complaint and to require an exhaustive investigation into what now appear to me to be **two separate and serious failures concerning the communication of my required attendance at Wood Green Crown Court.**

I am a defendant on bail.

The documents issued to me expressly state:

“You must attend court where and when required to do so.”

They also warn that failure to comply with the conditions may result in arrest and being brought back before the Court.

Accordingly, accurate communication of the **date, time and place at which I am required to attend** is not an administrative courtesy. It is information upon which my liberty and compliance with bail requirements may depend.

This is why I regard what has occurred as potentially dangerous.

I am not complaining merely because I was inconvenienced.

I am concerned because administrative failures concerning where and when a defendant must attend court can potentially create the appearance that the defendant has failed to comply when, in reality, the defendant has attempted to comply with the information supplied by the Court.

1.1. FEAR OF RACISM AND DEATH — WHY I AM SEEKING CLARIFICATION AND EVIDENCE

I consider it necessary to explain the words “**FEAR OF RACISM AND DEATH**” appearing at the beginning of this document so that my position cannot be misunderstood, exaggerated, minimised or subsequently mischaracterised.

I am a Black person.

I am presently a Black defendant involved in criminal proceedings and required to interact with the criminal justice system.

I am aware of the history and continuing public concern surrounding deaths of Black people in police custody and other circumstances involving state authorities. That knowledge forms part of the context in which I experience and assess matters concerning my own safety, liberty and treatment within the criminal justice system.

My reference to **death** does **not** mean that I am alleging that anybody at Wood Green Crown Court, HMCTS, the Metropolitan Police, the Crown Prosecution Service, court security or any other person intends to kill me, physically harm me or deliberately arrange for harm to come to me.

I make **no such allegation, accusation, assertion or assumption, and I have reached no such conclusion.**

My point is different.

When I am required to place my liberty and personal safety in the hands of criminal justice institutions, repeated unexplained problems affecting my treatment and my

ability to comply with court requirements inevitably increase my concern and reduce my confidence in simply accepting that everything is operating correctly.

The appropriate response to that concern is **not for me to make accusations without evidence.**

The appropriate response is for me to **ask questions, seek clarification, preserve evidence, obtain records and require the relevant public authorities to explain objectively what happened.**

That is precisely what I am doing.

WHY THESE EVENTS INCREASE MY CONCERN

The events described in this document do not exist in isolation.

In relation to an earlier hearing, I did not receive the relevant hearing notification by post.

On 24 September 2026, I attended Wood Green Crown Court on the basis of an official written document directing me to attend at **10:00 in Courtroom 01**. I followed that instruction. I waited outside Court 1. The stated hearing time passed. Nobody came to tell me that the arrangements had changed. I eventually investigated the position myself and discovered that the hearing had been moved to **Court 8**.

I then had to insist upon documentary evidence of the changed arrangements and ultimately obtained a court-stamped document bearing the handwritten notation **"11am Ct 8."**

These events matter because the Court's own documentation warns me of potentially serious consequences associated with failing to attend when required.

The problem is therefore not simply that administrative mistakes or communication failures may have occurred.

The problem from my perspective is that **I do not presently know why they occurred, who was responsible, what procedures should have prevented them, whether those procedures were followed, or what safeguards exist against repetition.**

That absence of information is itself why I am seeking evidence.

SUSPICION IS NOT A CONCLUSION

I want this distinction recorded with absolute clarity.

Concern is not proof.

Suspicion is not proof.

Fear is not proof.

A request for investigation is not an allegation that the suspected explanation has been established.

I do not presently know whether the matters described in this document resulted from ordinary human error, administrative failure, inadequate procedures, systemic failures, discriminatory processes, anti-Black racism, Institutional Racism, some combination of factors, or something entirely different.

The document itself already makes that distinction: I expressly state that I do not know whether these incidents resulted from individual human error, administrative failure, defective procedures, communication failures, systemic problems or another explanation.

That uncertainty is precisely why I require clarification and evidence.

I am not required to pretend that repeated unexplained events do not cause me concern merely because I do not yet possess evidence establishing their cause.

Equally, I do not consider it responsible to declare racism, discrimination or misconduct established without first obtaining and examining the evidence.

My position is therefore:

I am concerned.

I am suspicious because of what has occurred.

I have not reached a conclusion about the cause.

I am asking questions.

I am requesting preservation and disclosure of evidence.

I am asking HMCTS to explain its procedures and safeguards.

I will consider the evidence before reaching any conclusion.

WHY I ASK ABOUT ANTI-BLACK RACISM AND INSTITUTIONAL RACISM

Because I am a Black person, I specifically want to know what safeguards exist against **anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism** in the processes that affect me.

Asking that question does not amount to asserting that racism has occurred.

Indeed, the existing document already expressly states:

“I am not asserting that race caused either incident.”

It then asks whether safeguards exist, whether they were engaged, and how repeated administrative failures affecting a Black defendant are objectively examined rather than automatically treated as unrelated errors.

That distinction is fundamental.

If effective safeguards exist and were properly applied, HMCTS should be capable of identifying them and providing the relevant evidence.

If safeguards exist but were not applied, I require an explanation.

If no specific safeguards exist, I require HMCTS to state that clearly for the record.

WHY THE ISSUE OF LIBERTY MAKES THIS PARTICULARLY SERIOUS

My fear and concern are increased because these administrative matters are connected directly with my obligation to attend court.

The document issued to me states that I **“must attend court where and when required to do so.”** Your document correctly explains that accurate information about date, time and place is therefore not merely an administrative courtesy but information upon which compliance with bail requirements may depend.

I therefore cannot reasonably treat repeated unexplained problems concerning notification and attendance as insignificant.

I need to know what happened.

I need to know why it happened.

I need to know who was responsible for the relevant processes.

I need to know what the official records show.

I need to know whether any adverse record was created concerning my attendance.

I need to know what safeguards existed.

I need to know whether those safeguards operated.

And I need reliable written information to ensure that another administrative or communication failure does not place my liberty at risk.

MY POSITION FOR THE RECORD

For the avoidance of all possible doubt:

I make no allegation that either incident was caused by racism.

I make no allegation that either incident was caused by religious discrimination.

I make no allegation that anybody deliberately attempted to cause me to miss court.

I make no allegation that anybody deliberately attempted to cause a warrant to be issued.

I make no allegation that anybody intends to cause me physical harm or death.

I make no accusation of criminal conduct or deliberate misconduct.

I make no assumption about anybody's motive.

I have reached no conclusion about the cause of these events.

What I do say is that **the accumulation of unexplained problems gives me legitimate reason to ask serious questions, to seek clarification, to preserve the evidence and to require documentary answers before I reach any conclusion.**

That is the purpose of this complaint.

2. THIS IS THE SECOND INCIDENT

This incident must be considered against what happened concerning the previous hearing.

In relation to the earlier hearing, I did not receive the relevant hearing notification by post.

That created a situation in which I could have failed to attend a hearing because the written notification upon which an ordinary defendant should be entitled to rely had not reached me.

I have already raised concerns about that matter.

The incident on **24 September 2026** was different, but potentially just as serious.

This time I **did have an official written document** telling me when and where to attend.

I followed it.

Nevertheless, the arrangements were changed and I was not informed of the change before the stated hearing time passed.

3. THE WRITTEN INSTRUCTION FOR 24 SEPTEMBER 2026

The official **Notice of Grant of Bail dated 16 September 2026** instructed me to attend:

Date: 24 September 2026

Time: 10:00

Courtroom: Courtroom 01

Court: Wood Green Crown Court

Address: Woodall House, Lordship Lane, Wood Green, London, N22 5LF, United Kingdom

That was the official written information supplied to me.

I acted upon it.

4. I ATTENDED COURT AS DIRECTED

On 24 September 2026, I attended Wood Green Crown Court.

I went to the courtroom identified by the Court.

I waited outside **Court 1**.

I was therefore physically present in the court building and was waiting where the Court's written document instructed me to wait.

I did not decide for myself to wait outside Court 1.

I was there because the official document issued by the Court identified **Courtroom 01**.

5. 10:00 PASSED

The stated hearing time of **10:00** arrived and passed.

I had received no written notification that the courtroom had changed.

I had received no written notification that the hearing time had changed.

Nobody had come to me outside Court 1 to tell me that I was waiting at the wrong courtroom.

No usher had approached me and explained that my case had been moved.

I therefore became concerned.

6. I HAD TO INVESTIGATE MYSELF

I took the initiative and approached court security.

I asked what was happening.

Security personnel checked the records.

I was then informed that my hearing had been moved to **Court 8**.

I complained and asked why an usher or other member of court staff had not come to Court 1 to inform me.

This requires a substantive answer.

Had I simply continued doing exactly what the Court's written document instructed me to do — namely waiting at Court 1 — **what would have happened?**

7. I DEMANDED DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

Given my previous experience concerning hearing notification, I was not prepared simply to accept another verbal communication without evidence.

I required documentary evidence showing that the Court had changed the arrangements.

I encountered difficulty obtaining such evidence.

I persisted and requested official documentation on HMCTS material carrying the Court's stamp.

I eventually obtained a document bearing the **Wood Green Crown Court stamp dated 24 September 2026**.

The document bears the handwritten notation:

“11am Ct 8”

This is extremely important to my record.

The underlying Notice of Grant of Bail states:

24 September 2026 at 10:00 — Courtroom 01

The document stamped on 24 September now bears the handwritten notation:

11am Ct 8

I therefore possess documentary evidence showing the discrepancy between the original written instruction and the arrangements subsequently communicated to me after I investigated what was happening.

8. WHAT COULD HAVE HAPPENED IF I HAD NOT INVESTIGATED?

This is one of the central questions requiring an answer.

Suppose I had remained outside Court 1.

Suppose I had trusted the official Notice of Grant of Bail completely.

Suppose I had reasonably concluded that the hearing was delayed and continued waiting.

What mechanism existed to find me?

Would an usher eventually have checked Court 1?

Was anybody instructed to do so?

Was there any record showing that I had entered the building?

Did the Court know that I was physically present?

Could somebody in Court 8 have concluded that I had failed to attend?

Could I have been recorded as absent?

Could the prosecution or Court have been informed that I had not appeared?

Could an application for or consideration of a warrant have followed?

I require **specific answers based upon the actual procedures and records**, not speculation.

9. THE POSSIBILITY OF A WARRANT IS WHY THIS IS SERIOUS

I am particularly concerned because failure to surrender to the Court when required while on bail can have serious legal consequences.

Section 7(1) of the Bail Act 1976 provides that where a person released on bail who is under a duty to surrender to the custody of a court fails to surrender at the appointed time, the court **may issue a warrant for that person's arrest**.

The Criminal Practice Directions expressly recognise circumstances in which a person has failed to attend at the appointed time and a warrant has consequently been issued.

I therefore do **not** accept that accurate hearing notification can properly be dismissed as a minor administrative matter.

I am not asserting that a warrant definitely would have been issued against me on 24 September 2026.

I am asking something more fundamental:

Could failures in the Court's own communication arrangements have created circumstances in which I was wrongly regarded as absent when I was actually inside the court building, waiting at the courtroom identified in the Court's own written notice?

If the answer is **NO**, I require HMCTS to identify the safeguard which would have prevented that outcome.

If the answer is YES, I require HMCTS to explain how such a risk was permitted to arise, whether HMCTS considers that risk acceptable, and what corrective measures will now be implemented to prevent recurrence.

10. THIS COULD HAVE BECOME MY SECOND APPARENT MISSED ATTENDANCE

My concern is substantially increased because this follows the earlier notification problem.

The two incidents are different:

First incident: I did not receive the relevant hearing notification by post.

Second incident: I received written notification, attended in accordance with it and waited at the specified courtroom, but the arrangements were subsequently changed without the change being adequately communicated to me before the stated hearing time passed.

Either type of failure can potentially produce the same dangerous appearance:

that the defendant has failed to attend.

That is precisely why I require this matter investigated as a system and safeguarding issue rather than dismissed as two unrelated administrative mistakes.

11. THE POSITION OF AN ORDINARY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC

My concerns extend beyond my individual circumstances.

An ordinary defendant should be able to rely upon an official court document telling that person:

- the date;
- the time;
- the court building; and
- the courtroom

at which attendance is required.

A person should not need specialist knowledge of court administration to protect himself or herself from the consequences of an internal courtroom change.

A person should not need to investigate independently after the stated hearing time passes.

A person should not need to argue with staff to obtain documentary evidence establishing that the arrangements were changed.

And a person should not need retrospectively to reconstruct different notices, dates, courtroom numbers, verbal statements, handwritten amendments and court stamps simply to demonstrate:

“I was there. I followed the Court's instructions.”

12. WHY I REFUSED TO LEAVE WITHOUT THE NEXT HEARING IN WRITING

After today's hearing, I was told about the next hearing.

Given what had happened, I had lost confidence in relying upon verbal communication alone.

I therefore remained at Wood Green Crown Court and required court staff to print the next hearing information for me **before I left the building**.

I made clear that I wanted a hard-copy official record.

I was not prepared to leave and subsequently find myself in another dispute about what I had or had not been told.

I ultimately obtained a **Notice of Grant of Bail dated 24 September 2026**.

That document states that my next hearing is:

**15 October 2026 at 10:00
Courtroom 01
Wood Green Crown Court
Woodall House
Lordship Lane
Wood Green
London
N22 5LF
United Kingdom**

I now have documentary evidence of the next hearing because **I insisted upon obtaining it before leaving the Court**.

13. FORMAL RECTIFICATION OF THE RECORD

I require HMCTS to confirm unequivocally in writing that:

- 1.** I attended Wood Green Crown Court on 24 September 2026 as required;
- 2.** I was present in the court building before and at the time at which I had been instructed to attend;
- 3.** I waited outside Court 1 because Courtroom 01 was the courtroom identified in the official Notice of Grant of Bail;
- 4.** the case was subsequently dealt with in Court 8;
- 5.** the change of courtroom was not caused by me;
- 6.** there is no entry on the court record stating or suggesting that I failed to attend;
- 7.** there is no entry stating or suggesting that I breached bail by failing to attend;
- 8.** there is no entry attributing to me responsibility for any delay arising from the movement between Court 1 and Court 8; and

9. if any record presently contradicts any of the above, that record is identified immediately so that I can seek its correction.

14. QUESTIONS REQUIRING COMPLETE ANSWERS

I require HMCTS to establish and answer:

Who decided to move Case 01GD1160226 from Court 1 to Court 8?

At what exact time was that decision made?

At what exact time was the change entered onto the relevant court system?

What was the reason for the change?

Who was responsible for communicating the change to me?

How was that person expected to communicate it?

Was an usher instructed to go to Court 1?

Did an usher go to Court 1?

If so, at what time?

Was my name called at Court 1?

Was my name called anywhere else?

Was any attempt made to locate me?

Was security informed of the change before I approached them?

What record exists of my arrival at the building?

What record exists of my attendance?

At any stage was I recorded as absent, missing, late or having failed to answer when called?

At any stage was the possibility of a warrant discussed, considered, requested or recorded?

At any stage was a possible breach of bail recorded or considered?

What procedure exists for locating a defendant who is waiting at the courtroom identified on an official notice after the case has been moved elsewhere?

Was that procedure followed in my case?

If not, why not?

15. THE EARLIER NOTIFICATION FAILURE

I also require the investigation to address the earlier incident in which I did not receive the relevant hearing notification by post.

HMCTS should establish:

what document should have been sent;

when it was generated;

when it was dispatched;

how it was dispatched;

to what address;

what record proves dispatch;

who was responsible for dispatch;

whether any failure has been identified; and

what action was subsequently taken.

The two incidents must then be examined together to determine whether there is a recurring administrative problem affecting communications concerning my attendance.

16. PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE

I formally request the immediate preservation of all potentially relevant evidence concerning both incidents, including:

CCTV showing my arrival and presence within Wood Green Crown Court on 24 September 2026;

CCTV covering Court 1, Court 8 and relevant corridors and waiting areas;

security logs;

entry records;

court lists;

original and amended court lists;

electronic listing records;

audit trails showing alterations to courtroom allocation;

records showing when the matter moved from Court 1 to Court 8;

usher notes and records;

records of names called;

attendance records;

hearing logs;

emails;

Teams or other internal messages;

telephone records where relevant;

communications between court staff and security;

records concerning consideration of my absence or attendance;

records concerning any consideration of a warrant or breach of bail;

records concerning the previous hearing notification;

printing and dispatch records; and

any other material capable of establishing what happened.

Please confirm immediately that relevant material has been preserved and will not be destroyed, overwritten or routinely deleted while this matter remains unresolved.

17. NO ACCUSATIONS OR PREMATURE CONCLUSIONS

I make **no accusation, no allegation, no assertion of misconduct, no assumption and no conclusion** about why these events occurred.

I am requesting evidence.

I do not know whether these incidents resulted from individual human error, administrative failure, defective procedures, communication failures, systemic problems or some other explanation.

That is precisely why an investigation is required.

I will consider the evidence before reaching any conclusion.

18. SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ANTI-BLACK RACISM AND INSTITUTIONAL RACISM

Because I am a Black person and because I have already raised safeguarding concerns concerning my treatment within these proceedings, I additionally require HMCTS to identify whether there are safeguards against **anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism** within the administrative decision-making and court-management processes relevant to these incidents.

I am **not asserting that race caused either incident**.

I am asking whether safeguards exist, whether they were engaged, and how HMCTS can demonstrate objectively that repeated administrative failures affecting a Black

defendant are examined for the possibility of discriminatory or institutionally discriminatory processes rather than simply being dismissed individually as unrelated errors.

If specific safeguards were applied, identify them and provide the relevant records.

If no such safeguards were applied, please state that expressly for the record.

19. THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION

The fundamental question is simple:

How can a defendant be threatened with serious consequences for failing to attend court when failures in the Court's own notification and communication systems can potentially prevent that defendant from knowing where and when he is supposed to appear?

I require HMCTS to answer that question in the context of what actually happened to me.

I attended.

I followed the written instructions.

I waited at the specified courtroom.

I investigated when nothing happened.

I obtained evidence of the changed arrangements because I insisted upon it.

And after the hearing I remained at court until I obtained hard-copy evidence of my next hearing because I no longer considered verbal information sufficient to protect my position.

That sequence requires a proper documentary explanation.

20. RESPONSE REQUIRED

Every question in this document is substantive and **not rhetorical**.

Where a question is capable of a **YES or NO** answer, please provide YES or NO first and then provide the explanation and evidence.

If HMCTS cannot answer a question, will not answer it, considers that it should not answer it, does not hold the information or relies upon another reason for not answering, please identify the question and state the reason expressly for the record.

I require:

a complete written response;

confirmation of preservation of evidence;

confirmation of my attendance on 24 September 2026;

confirmation that no adverse attendance or bail record has been created against me as a result of the Court 1/Court 8 issue;

identification of the persons responsible for investigating these matters;


a complaint/reference number;

the applicable response deadline; and

confirmation in writing of my next hearing on 15 October 2026 at 10:00 and the procedure that will be followed to notify me if the courtroom or hearing arrangements change.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Derrick Lynch', with a large circular flourish at the start and a long diagonal stroke extending to the right.

Derrick Emmanuel Lynch

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'John Canoe' in a cursive, slanted script.

also known as John Canoe

Defendant / Litigant in Person

Case Reference: 01GD1160226



Sitting at Wood Green Crown Court



2138_1062120001_05180_0072

Derrick LYNCH
23 Jersey House
2 Eastfield Road
Enfield
London
EN3 5UY



1062120001/05180 (1/2)

Case reference 01GD1160226

Defendant Derrick LYNCH

Date of birth 29 February 1964

Notice of Grant of Bail

Date of notice 16 September 2026

The cases have been adjourned:

For a case management hearing to discuss and identify the issues in the case and then fix a trial date. You should attend with witness names, addresses and dates of birth (if any) together with their availability for the trial date.

The court has granted you bail.

You must attend court where and when required to do so.

Details of your next hearing

Date and time:

24 September 2026 at 10:00

Location:

Courtroom Courtroom 01
Wood Green Crown Court
Woodall House
Lordship Lane
Wood Green
London
N22 5LF

Derrick LYNCH

Page 1 of 3



Sitting at Wood Green Crown Court

Derrick LYNCH
23 Jersey House
2 Eastfield Road
Enfield
London
EN3 5UY

Case reference 01GD1160226
Defendant Derrick LYNCH
Date of birth 29 February 1964

Notice of Grant of Bail

Date of notice 24 September 2026

The cases have been adjourned:

For a case management hearing to discuss and identify the issues in the case and then fix a trial date. You should attend with witness names, addresses and dates of birth (if any) together with their availability for the trial date.

The court has granted you bail.

You must attend court where and when required to do so.

Details of your next hearing

Date and time:

15 October 2026 at 10:00

Location:

Courtroom Courtroom 01
Wood Green Crown Court
Woodall House
Lordship Lane
Wood Green
London
N22 5LF

Derrick LYNCH

Page 1 of 3



Sitting at Wood Green Crown Court

On 20 Apr 2026 at London in the borough of Hackney, with intent to cause Shliome Ginsberg harassment, alarm or distress, displayed any writing, sign or other visible representation which was threatening, abusive or insulting, thereby causing that person or another harassment, alarm or distress.
Contrary to section4A(1) and (5) of the Public Order Act 1986.

Derrick LYNCH

Page 3 of 3

Wood Green Crown Court

Woodall House
Lordship Lane
Wood Green
London
N22 5LF

DX 130346 WOOD GREEN 3

T 020 8826 4138
F 020 8826 4230

E woodgreencrowncourt@justice.gov.uk

Minicom VII 020 7210 2231
(Helpline for the deaf and hard of hearing)



**HM Courts
& Tribunals
Service**

woodgreencrowncourt@justice.gov.uk

11am C+8



Sitting at Wood Green Crown Court

Conditions:

You must not enter London Borough of Hackney, save for travelling by public transport, and he must not alight in Hackney..

2) Not to wear any clothing with swastika on it AND 3) Not to be in possession of any sign or document bearing a swastika on it in a public place.

Reasons:

To prevent offending

Warning

If you do not keep any of these conditions you can be arrested and brought back to court. You must attend court when and where required to do so. Unless your attendance has been excused at the next hearing and recorded above, you will commit an offence if you do not attend court on the date and at the time and place as instructed, as shown above or on any **other** date and time as **directed** by the court. If you do not attend when told a warrant may be issued for your arrest.

Note

You should attend Court 30 minutes before the time shown above and have seen your Solicitor (if you have one), in good time before the date of hearing.

Case reference: 01GD1160226

On 20 Apr 2026 at London in the borough of Hackney with intent to cause Shaye Fischer harassment, alarm or distress displayed some writing, sign or other visible representation which was threatening, abusive or insulting thereby causing that or another person harassment, alarm or distress and the offence was racially aggravated within the terms of section 28 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

Contrary to section 31(b) and (4) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

On 20 Apr 2026 at London in the borough of Hackney with intent to cause Shliome Ginsberg harassment, alarm or distress displayed some writing, sign or other visible representation which was threatening, abusive or insulting thereby causing that or another person harassment, alarm or distress and the offence was racially aggravated within the terms of section 28 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.



Contrary to section 31(b) and (4) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

On 20/04/2026 at LONDON in the Borough of Hackney, with intent to cause Shaye FISCHER harassment, alarm or distress, displayed any writing, sign or other visible representation which was threatening, abusive or insulting, thereby causing that person or another harassment, alarm or distress

Contrary to section 4A(1) and (5) of the Public Order Act 1986.

Derrick LYNCH

Page 2 of 3

REPARATIONS POLICE CODES FOR REPARATIONS POLICE CODES FOR REPARATIONS											
	IC1		W1 UK White W2 White European W9 Other White	QUESTION: White skin, Caucasoid, highest life value, pure blood, Aryan, Japhetic, Celtic, Nordic, Viking, Norse, Germanic, Slavic, Baltic, straight red/ginger or blond/blonde hair, blue, grey, green or pale eyes, not visibly contaminated with non-white blood but freckles are acceptable? UK RACE TAX 0-6%?	FAMILY: Absolute Nuclear, Egalitarian Nuclear –Low intergenerational cohabitation, early home-leaving, privacy-valued.						
	IC2		W9 Other White Dark European	QUESTION: Darkened skin, Sallow, Swarthy, Tawny, Olive skin, Melanochroid, Iberian Peninsula, Mediterranean, Balkan, straight dark hair (no curls), slightly lower life value, Dark eyes, visibly contaminated with non-white blood? UK RACE TAX 6-13%?	FAMILY: Endogamous Communitarian, Asymmetric –Patriarchal extended families, high respect for elders, strong honour culture.						
	IC3		B1 Caribbean B2 African B9 Other Black	QUESTION: Black Skin Negroid, Hamitic, Moor, Bantu, Cushite, Kaffir, Kinky/Curly Dark hair, Dark eyes? UK RACE TAX 33-66%?	FAMILY: Endogamous Communitarian, Asymmetric –Arranged marriages, multigenerational homes, patriarchal authority, family honour central.						
	IC4		A1 Indian A2 Pakistani A3 Bangladeshi A9 Other Asian	QUESTION: Brown/Dark Skin Asianoid, South Asian, Hindutva, Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Straight hair, Dark eyes? UK RACE TAX 22-33%?	FAMILY: Endogamous Communitarian, Asymmetric –Arranged marriages, multigenerational homes, patriarchal authority, family honour central.						
	IC5		O1 Chinese O9 Any Other Oriental	QUESTION: Yellow Skin Mongoloid, Epicanthic fold, Slit eyes, Neotenic, Sinodonty, Straight hair that never curls, Dark eyes? UK RACE TAX 22-33%?	FAMILY: Absolute Nuclear, Filial-Flexible –Confucian values, filial piety, elder care in private home, education-centred.						
	IC6		M1 White & Black Caribbean M2 White & Black African M3 White & Asian M9 Any Other Mixed	QUESTION: Semitic, Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Arab, Israeli, North American, South American, Mixed Lineage, Mixed Race, Mongrel, North African, Stateless, visibly contaminated with Black blood? UK RACE TAX 0-66%?	FAMILY: Flexible System, Chosen Support –Mixed identity negotiation, hybrid parenting, often fluid structures, blended cultures.						
	IC7		NS Not Stated	QUESTION: Unseen, Unrecognised, Unhuman, Unknown, Alien, Computer, Robot, Artificial Intelligence, Humanoid? TAX FREE?	FAMILY: Anomic, Unknown or Chosen –Fragmented or concealed systems; may reflect institutional upbringing or systemic exclusion.						
UK Government Race and Ethnicity Codes. Are you a Racist?											
	IC1		W1 UK White W2 White European W9 Other White		IC3		B1 Caribbean B2 African B9 Other Black		IC6		M1 White & Black Caribbean M2 White & Black African M3 White & Asian M9 Any Other Mixed
1 White Race	WBRI	White British		3 Black Race	BAFR	Black - African		6 Mixed Race	MABL	Asian and Black	
1 White Race	WCOR	White British - Cornish		3 Black Race	BANN	Black - Angolan		6 Mixed Race	MACH	Asian and Chinese	
1 White Race	WENG	White British - English		3 Black Race	BAOF	Other Black African		6 Mixed Race	MAOE	Asian and Any Other Ethnic Group	
1 White Race	WSCO	White British - Scottish		3 Black Race	BCON	Black - Congolese		6 Mixed Race	MBCH	Black and Chinese	
1 White Race	WWEL	White British - Welsh		3 Black Race	BCRB	Black Caribbean		6 Mixed Race	MBOE	Black and Any Other Ethnic Group	
1 White Race	WOWB	White British Other		3 Black Race	BEUR	Black European		6 Mixed Race	MCOE	Chinese and Any Other Ethnic Group	
1 White Race	WIRI	White - Irish		3 Black Race	BGHA	Black - Ghanalan		6 Mixed Race	MOTH	Any Other Mixed Background	
1 White Race	WIRT	White - Traveller of Irish Heritage		3 Black Race	BNAM	Black North American		6 Mixed Race	MOTM	Other Mixed Background	
1 White Race	WEEU	White Eastern European		3 Black Race	BNGN	Black - Nigerian		6 Mixed Race	MWAI	White and Indian	
1 White Race	WEUR	White European		3 Black Race	BOTB	Other Black		6 Mixed Race	MWAO	White and Any Other Asian Background	
1 White Race	WOTW	White Other		3 Black Race	BOTH	Any Other Black Background		6 Mixed Race	MWAP	White and Pakistani	
1 White Race	WWEU	White Western European		3 Black Race	BSLN	Black - Sierra Leonean		6 Mixed Race	MWAS	White and Asian	
				3 Black Race	BSOM	Black - Somali		6 Mixed Race	MWBA	White and Black African	
				3 Black Race	BSUD	Black - Sudanese		6 Mixed Race	MWBC	White and Black Caribbean	
								6 Mixed Race	MWCH	White and Chinese	
								6 Mixed Race	MWOC	White and Any Other Ethnic Group	
								6 Other Race	OAFG	Afghan	
								6 Other Race	OARA	Arab Other	
								6 Other Race	OEGY	Egyptian	
								6 Other Race	OFIL	Filipino	
								6 Other Race	OIRN	Iranian	
								6 Other Race	OIRQ	Iraqi	
								6 Other Race	OJPN	Japanese	
								6 Other Race	OKOR	Korean	
								6 Other Race	OKRD	Kurdish	
								6 Other Race	OLAM	Latin/ South/ Central American	
								6 Other Race	OLEB	Lebanese	
								6 Other Race	OLIB	Libyan	
								6 Other Race	OMAL	Malay	
								6 Other Race	OMRC	Moroccan	
								6 Other Race	OOEG	Other Ethnic Group	
								6 Other Race	OOth	Any Other Ethnic Group	
								6 Other Race	OPOL	Polynesian	
								6 Other Race	OTHA	Thai	
								6 Other Race	OVIE	Vietnamese	
								6 Other Race	OYEM	Yemeni	
	IC2		W9 Other White (Dark European)		IC4		A1 Indian A2 Pakistani A3 Bangladeshi A9 Other Asian		IC7		NS Not Stated
2 White Race	WALB	Albanian		4 Asian Race	AAFR	African Asian		7 Not Known Yet	NOBT	Information Not Yet Obtained	
2 White Race	WOTH	Any Other White Background		4 Asian Race	ABAN	Bangladeshi		7 Rebel Race	REFU	Refused	
2 White Race	WBOS	Bosnian- Herzegovinian		4 Asian Race	AIND	Indian					
2 White Race	WCRO	Croatian		4 Asian Race	AKAO	Kashmiri Other					
2 White Race	WGRK	Greek		4 Asian Race	AKPA	Kashmiri Pakistani					
2 White Race	WGRC	Greek Cypriot		4 Asian Race	AMPK	Mirpuri Pakistani					
2 White Race	WGRE	Greek/ Greek Cypriot		4 Asian Race	ANEP	Nepali					
2 White Race	WROM	Gypsy / Roma		4 Asian Race	AOPK	Other Pakistani					
2 White Race	WITA	Italian		4 Asian Race	AOTA	Other Asian					
2 White Race	WKOS	Kosovan		4 Asian Race	AOTH	Any Other Asian Background					
2 White Race	WPOR	Portuguese		4 Asian Race	APKN	Pakistani					
2 White Race	WSER	Serbian		4 Asian Race	ASLT	Sri Lankan Tamil					
2 White Race	WTUK	Turkish		4 Asian Race	ASNL	Sri Lankan Sinhalese					
2 White Race	WTUC	Turkish Cypriot		4 Asian Race	ASRO	Sri Lankan Other					
2 White Race	WTUR	Turkish/ Turkish Cypriot									
					</						